

## 2.1. MODERN MEDIA CULTURE: GAINS AND LOSSES

---

DOI 10.15826/B978-5-7996-3081-2.22

### The Notion of Media Culture: An Attempt at Deconstruction

**Yarkova Elena**

Tyumen State University, Tyumen, Russia  
e.n.yarkova@utmn.ru

**Abstract.** In modern Russian cultural studies, the concept of “media culture” appears: as a marker of a popular research trend, and as a “floating signifier” — a conceptual “semi-finished product” that blurs the content of this research trend, introducing elements of chaos into its scientific space. The concept of “media culture”, its theoretical foundations, and conceptual parameters are identified as the object of this research. The aim of the research is to deconstruct the concept of “media culture”. The research methodology combines some ideas of poststructuralism, hermeneutics, axiology, phenomenology, and self-organization theory. The main content of the article is: a) “demolition” (dismantling) of the process of formation of the concept “media culture”, identifying the elements of which are assembled the modern theory of media culture, detection of inherent contradictions; and identifying bottlenecks in the domestic theory of media culture; b) build a theory of media culture, aimed at overcoming existing contradictions and gaps. Conclusions: the concept of “media culture” means a certain fragment of cultural reality, one of the forms of culture that has a multi-layered phenomenal and nominal content, a complex structure, vital functions and complex mechanisms of dynamics.

**Keywords:** Media culture, media, culture of media, mediaphilosophy, phenomenal, nominal, epiphenomenal, values and meanings

### 1. Introduction

Media culture research has now become a kind of cultural mainstream. This has happened due to many factors, the main one is a rapid change and

complexity of this culture. In fact, we live in an era of permanent revolution of media culture which permanently catches our attention and arouses interest. In line with this interest, such a spontaneous trend appeared, without serious reflection, as the articulation of a new scientific discipline — media culture. The latter circumstance does not cause much optimism, because if the concept of “media culture”, according to researchers, is in a state of evolution [Kuznetsova, 2009, 356], what can we say about media culture? In other words, the desire to “promote” a new discipline, a research program in conditions when the subject of this discipline is at the stage of formation, there should be a certain amount of scientific adventurism. To soften this situation, researchers used a well known technique and declared media culture as an integrative field of research: “Media culture is formed as a new scientific area within which media culture acts as something complete and whole and it is able to provide the necessary integration of various levels of research, thereby connecting a significant number of specific disciplines” [Vokhrysheva, 2014, 194].

Of course, the idea to combine everything related to the study of media culture and assign the name of media culture to the result has its logic. However, if we consider that in Russian cultural studies, media culture refers to very different realities, objects, and even objects’ characteristics, it is very possible that the result of such a combination will be a canvas of concepts made in patchwork technique. In itself, the principle of patchwork (the principle of epistemological anarchism) only seems to embody creativity, but in fact, it creates significant obstacles to the growth of scientific knowledge, since the new is always the product of synthesis, but not of mechanical aggregation.

So, a serious scientific problem is the presence of certain theoretical gaps in the conceptualization of media culture as an object of research. The essence of these gaps lies in the growing number of conflicting interpretations of the concept of “media culture” and the absence of a universal, even generalized (but, nevertheless, based on the modern cultural scientific picture of the world, demonstrating a certain fragment of reality) interpretation of this concept. Thus, in modern epistemology a mono-object does not necessarily exclude multiple objects of research, from the point of view of postnonclassical science any object is complex and involves a wide field of research.

There’s no doubt that the problem of elaboration of the culturally universal “media culture” is extremely large-scale and requires serious collective

efforts. For this article, the author sets a task to draw the attention of researchers to some theoretical and methodological inconsistencies in the theory of media culture and outline ways to eliminate them.

## **2. Resources of the study**

The study has a general theoretical nature, based on second-order reflection. The main resources of the research are a wide range of various texts by domestic and foreign authors devoted to the study of media culture. Attention is focused on the texts of the authors of Frankfurt school of Critical Sociology, The British “cultural study”, poststructuralism-postmodernism, media philosophy, as well as modern cultural studies of the media culture of domestic authors.

## **3. Methodology**

The ideas of poststructuralism, hermeneutics, axiology, phenomenology, and self-organization theory are relevant. The research methods consist of two main procedures.

1. “Demolition” (dismantling) of the developing process of the concept “media culture”, identification of elements from which the modern theory of media culture is assembled, detection of its inherent contradictions; identification of problem areas of the national theory of media culture.

2. “Assembling” theory of media culture, which has an aim to overcome existing contradictions and gaps.

## **4. Description of the study**

### *4.1. Three sources and three components of the theory of “media culture”*

The concept of “media culture” has almost a century of history. It was updated in the first half of the XX century and quickly implemented into social and humanitarian discursive practices. Of course, this concept did not appear out of nothing. We can agree with Toulmin, who believes that the articulation of new concepts is connected with the understanding of new problems, that concepts obtain meaning due to the fact that they serve human purposes in real practical situations [Toulmin, 1972, 25]. The concept of “media culture” is not an exception, it arises as a result of understanding the negative consequences of industrialization, along with criticism of capitalism and totalitarianism. Here we are talking about the Euro-American discourse, in Russia, the theory of media culture has been developed much

later and, to a large extent, as a product of the “catch-up development” of social and humanitarian knowledge.

The well-known American cultural theorist Douglas Kellner believes that the basics of media culture theory were elaborated by the efforts of representatives of three scientific fields: Frankfurt School of Critical Sociology, British cultural study, and poststructuralism-postmodernism [Kellner, 1995, 15–54].

The creators of the notion “media culture” are considered to be representatives of the Frankfurt School of Critical Sociology. A. Hepp [Hepp, 2013] believes that the appearance of the notion “media culture” occurs in the book by M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno “Dialectics of enlightenment” [Adorno and Horkheimer, 1986, 126]. The Frankfurt school had an extremely negative attitude to media culture as a “cultural industry” that provides ideological legitimization of existing capitalist societies, through the suppression of individuality, manipulation of people’s consciousness, and mass culture. The Russian researcher of media culture Alla Chernykh argues that the views of scholars of the Frankfurt school were apocalyptic. They believed that the mass media played a crucial role in Hitler’s rise to power. In addition, they believed that a similar process was taking place in America: the mass media, by its way and direction of influence on mass consciousness and behavior, creates a background for the destruction of democracy and the emergence of a totalitarian dictatorship [Chernykh, 2007, 22]. Thus, initially “media culture” was considered as “false culture” (P. Bogomil) and as a product of the cultural industry, mass culture. This may have been a valid vision in this context, but it is hardly universal. Nevertheless, the initial “vicious connection” of the concept of “media culture” with the concepts of “mass culture” and “cultural industries” significantly influenced it.

The theory of media culture was being significantly reinterpreted by British cultural studies at the Birmingham Center for contemporary cultural research in the late 1950s. Thanks to the efforts of representatives of the British cultural studies, the theory of media culture has become more and more voluminous and multidimensional from a flat, one-dimensional one.

Firstly, there is a rejection of the “masterpiece approach” to the study of culture, according to which culture can only be called “high culture” — classical literature, art, etc. The attention of representatives of this direction is attracted by “low” — everyday culture. This approach led to the rehabilitation of media culture (television, film, etc.), rejected by the Frankfurt School.

For example, the founder of the Birmingham Center for cultural research, R. Hogarth, studied working-class media culture [Hogarth, 1960].

Secondly, the idea of media culture as exclusively mass culture has been rejected. A scholar of British cultural studies, R. Williams, suggested that the definition of “mass culture” should be abandoned in relation to media culture and the definition of “popular culture” should be used instead [Williams, 1960].

Thirdly, media culture is no longer seen as the most powerful manipulator of public consciousness. Another scholar of British cultural studies, S. Hall, puts forward the idea of understanding media culture as a popular forum. His theory of communication as a process of “encoding-decoding” deprives media culture of the status of the ruler of the people’s consciousness. As one of the decoding options, Hall puts forward “semantic guerilla” — an oppositional cultural code, in fact, a fronderic way of perceiving translated meanings [Hall, 2001].

Fourthly, media culture seemed to be an instrument of struggle in the processes of confrontation between different social (racial, class, gender, ethnic) layers. It is something heterogeneous, but not homogeneous. In other words, it is considered from the perspective of multiculturalism, which is generally inherent in British cultural studies [Kurennoy, 2012, 15].

Poststructuralism-postmodernism gives its own version of the theory of media culture. To a certain extent postmodernism synthesizes the approaches of Frankfurt School and British cultural study. On the one hand, postmodern theorists return to the idea of identifying media culture with mass culture and cultural industries. Media culture again appears in a critical perspective as an area of space for the birth of myths and illusions, the creation of “false consciousness”. This phenomenon was presented by R. Barthes, who demonstrated the connection between modern mythology and media culture [Barthes, 1991].

On the other hand, media culture is a leading form of postmodern culture. Postmodernist point of view of the world as a formless rhizome, the statement that the world exists only in interpretations, which can be many, “semantic cancellation of reality” (Baudrillard) “castration of reality” (Bart) can be considered as factors that contribute to the elevation of media culture over other forms of culture. Baudrillard’s position is significant in this regard, as he could not choose between a critical disregard for media culture or an awareness of its triumph over social life [Baudrillard, 1993].

So, three sources and three components of the theory of media culture define media culture as:

- a set of things invented by industrialism — radio, cinema, television, etc.;
- peculiarity of industrial and post-industrial societies, modernity and postmodernity;
- a social phenomenon that influences the formation of public consciousness.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the Frankfurt School, British cultural study, and post-structuralism-postmodernism are not cultural studies at all, but the sociology of media culture.

#### *4.2. Media philosophy and the end of the theory of media culture as a peculiarity of modernism and postmodernism*

A quick review of modern media culture research shows that the understanding of media culture today does not fit into the framework of the theoretical constructions of the Frankfurt school, British cultural study or post-structuralism-postmodernism, but that it includes new ideas and principles. And it seems that the main subject of this kind of semantic upgrade is media philosophy.

According to one of the leading experts on media philosophy in Russia, V. V. Savchuk: "...the term "media philosophy" appears for the first time in German-language research in the early 90's. (...) The question of media philosophy as an independent discipline is usually correlated with the time of the publication of Frank Hartman's book "Media philosophy". Further thematization and conceptualization of media philosophy occurs in the program works of Norbert Bolz, Friedrich Kittler, Mathias Vogel, Lorenz Engel, Werner Konitzer, Sybil Kramer, Mike Sandbote, Reinhardt Margreiter, Dieter Mersch, Stefan Munker, Alexander Roesler, Georg Tholen, Lambert Wising and a number of other researchers. A review of their concepts and a detailed analysis of discussions about a new discipline that is still quite young, but has already become history, are waiting for researchers" [Savchuk, 14, 33–34]. It is difficult to disagree with the last remark, because media philosophy is an extremely broad field of ideas, and these ideas are so deep and original that they require a separate serious conversation. I will allow myself to highlight just a few of them concerning the problem of deconstructing the concept of "media culture".

I need to say that media philosophy does not operate with the concept of "media culture", but the central concept of media philosophy is the con-

cept of “media reality”. However, it is clear that media reality is not a part of natural reality, but a part of cultural reality. Thus, media philosophy can be considered as a philosophy of media culture; media philosophy quite adequately accomplishes the functions of the philosophy of media culture. In particular, it makes a very serious breakthrough in the theory of media culture. What is the essence of this breakthrough?

Firstly, media philosophy declares media as a phenomenon — a phenomenon as such, but not an epiphenomenon — an attribute of any other phenomena. The founding fathers of media philosophy put forward the idea that the media is not just a passive transmitter of information, but media is at the source of information. The pioneer in this regard was M. McLuhan, who stated that a message can change its meaning depending on what form it is clothed in: oral utterance, manuscript, printed text, radio, television [McLuhan, 1964, 318]. This was especially convincingly demonstrated by F. Kittler, for example, the creation of the philosophy of Augustine and Hegel from modern at that time media. F. Kittler believed that human knowledge depends in a decisive way on the technologies used for its fixation and translation. This kind of technology, in Kittler’s view, is not just a tool that people use to generate values. They define a matrix within which something like a value becomes possible [Kittler, 1999, 25].

Secondly, media reality is not considered in media philosophy as a product of the industrial and post-industrial era, modernity and postmodernity. The idea is that media reality is a universal cultural phenomenon that is not limited by time and space. For example, Alexander Roesler believes that the development of new media is not so important for media philosophy, since the latter is “thinking about media in connection with the concept of “media”, about understanding what this concept should mean, about the theoretical impact of this concept on other concepts, and about the status of those theories that use this concept” [Roesler, 2003, 35].

Third, the media is defined as a formative force of culture, a booster for social development. One of the founders of media theory and aesthetics, Walter Benjamin identifies and describes the relationship between media development, art production, and perception change. His main thesis is that perception is always historical and depends on the media, practices, and techniques [Benjamin, 2002, 411].

These three statements radically change the perception of media culture, but they also add a fair amount of misunderstanding. In particular, we

can note such a paradox or contradiction presented in many Russian texts that media culture is the culture of industrial and post-industrial society, and (usually with reference to McLuhan) that media culture originates in the primitive world.

#### *4.3. Features of the national theory of media culture*

As we can see, cultural and philosophical interpretations of media culture differ. And there is the problem of a radical revision of the cultural theory of media, considering philosophical discoveries. In Russian science, this revision is also extremely problematic due to terminological difficulties. We can say that the concept of “media culture” in Russia is not lucky and this bad luck was due to at least five things.

Firstly, a serious obstacle to the development of the concept of “media culture” was a norm of replacing the lexeme “media” in Russian texts with two lexical constructions — “means of mass information” and “means of mass communication”. This kind of translation algorithm, which is technologically similar to D. Serle’s thought experiment “Chinese room”, has caused a very serious confusion in the study of media culture. For example, E. V. Kolesnikov comments on this situation as follows: “a Russian-speaking media researcher has to work with additional concepts: means of mass information and means of mass communication. The latter refer to the internationally recognized terms “media” (...) and “mass media” (...), but do not replace them. The need to translate generally accepted concepts in the world to those accepted exclusively in Russia (and vice versa) hinders a correct understanding of the specifics of the study problems” [Kolesnikov, 2017, 292].

The second thing is another serious obstacle to the conceptualization of media culture in Russian cultural studies, the semantic nuances inherent in the concept of “media” and the concepts of “means of mass information” and “means of mass communication”. These nuances relate to certain connotations that, whether we like it or not, make it difficult to conceptualize media culture. Even in the medieval philosophical tradition, the concept of “medium” was interpreted as an intermediary, “media” as a special substance connecting different worlds. In the tradition that seems to come from I. Kant, the concept of “means” deliberately puts the stigma of instrumentality, utilitarianism on the object that it denotes. It seems that the use of the word “means” in relation to media culture emasculates the whole essence of this culture, which, by definition, is not a means, but a target, an attraction around which the self-organization of culture is carried out. The identification



of the concept of “media” and the concepts of “means of mass information” and “means of mass communication” makes it extremely difficult to define the reality that the concept of “media culture” denotes. Consequently, it turns media culture into a cumatoid — an object that is always filled with new content.

The third thing is that making the concept of “media” equal to the concepts of “means of mass information” and “means of mass communication” shortens their life extremely. Since the concepts of “means of mass communication” and “means of mass communication” have a very specific interpretation — press, photography, radio, cinema, television, Internet, etc., then media also becomes an attribute of industrial and post-industrial society. This interpretation leads to the limitation of media culture research and eliminates the possibility of looking at media culture as an integral part of culture.

The fourth thing is that making the concept of “media” equal to the concepts of “means of mass information” and “means of mass communication” contributes to long lasting misunderstanding that media culture is an element of mass culture. It is clear that media culture can be mass and elite, while the means of mass information and means of mass communication are by definition mass media.

Fifthly, making the concept of “media” equal the concepts of “means of mass information” and “means of mass communication” hides the mechanisms of cultural reproduction, in particular the role of media culture in this process.

## **5. Results and their interpretation**

### *5.1. Media culture as the object of cultural studies*

So, what is media culture from the perspective of modern cultural studies? What is its essence, structure, functions, and mechanisms of dynamics?

In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to move away from the “natural attitude”, according to which media culture is press, radio, television, and the Internet. And move on to a phenomenological attitude aimed at understanding what media culture is in the strictly scientific sense of the word, what is the essence, structure, functions, and mechanisms of media culture dynamics from the point of view of cultural studies.

### *5.2. The essence of media culture*

From an initial point of view, it is considered that the definition of media culture should be somewhat of a special reality. Media culture is a part of cul-

ture, one of its forms. Obviously, we need to accept the fact that the concept of “media culture” should be put in the same list with such familiar concepts as “economic culture”, “political culture”, “religious culture”, “art culture”, “moral culture”, “scientific culture”. And here another important point is that despite close links between media culture and political, economic, and artistic culture, it is not reducible to any of these forms of culture. The reduction of one form of culture to another should be considered as a forbidden technique, since it always leads to both theoretical and pragmatic dead ends. This kind of reduction was criticized by P. Bourdieu, who criticized a phenomenon of the substitution of truly scientific knowledge for pop science, when journalists, who are supposed to popularize the results of scientific research, play a role of scientists expressing their experience and opinions as scientific knowledge, thereby creating serious obstacles to the growth of science [Bourdieu, 1976, 90].

Media culture, like any other form of culture, can be viewed from two points: phenomenal — as the sphere of artificial, man-made objects, and noumenal — as the sphere of meanings and values that make up the essence of these objects.

From a phenomenal point of view, media culture is a huge array of artifacts that are used to record and transmit information, i. e., language, writing, printed texts, telegraph, telephone, radio, television, Internet, etc. the phenomenal world of media culture is often referred to as media technologies. It should be said that media technologies are not the result of the inventive mind of technologists who intended to develop only their narrow specialized field of interest and were unaware of progressive ideas of those times. These technologies did not come from nowhere and were not given to people as a set of rules of the game. In this case we agree with J. Simondon who claims that a certain mental scheme is reflected in a technical invention, and human nature is contained in a technical thing — a person invents a thing by implementing his own nature in it [Simondon, 2014].

It is necessary to say that the phenomenal approach to the study of media culture in Russian science is popular today. The Russian scientific electronic library eLibrary provides the evidence. For a demand “media culture” limited to 2019, this database provides a little more than 130 titles, most of which are devoted to the role of television, the Internet, etc. in the life of modern people and society. At the same time, the very concept of “media culture” in this frame appears in the meaning of the level of knowledge or application of the latest media technologies in a particular sphere of society. One of the leading re-

searchers of media culture in Russia, N. B. Kirillova defines media culture exactly in the phenomenal context: "Media culture is a set of information and communication tools developed by mankind during their cultural and historical development, that have an aim to contribute to the formation of public consciousness and socialization of the individual. All types of media (audio, print, visual, audio-visual) include the culture of information transmission and the culture of its perception; media culture can also act as a system of levels of personal development that can "read", analyze and evaluate the media text, engage in media creation, learn new knowledge through the media, and so on. At the same time, it should taken into account that the development of media culture is a historically determined process, natural from the point of view of the evolution of civilization" [Kirillova, 2005, 19].

Undoubtedly, the reflection on the emergence, development, various types of media technologies and their impact on society is extremely significant, at least because they form a, continuously changing image of this culture. But the knowledge about media culture is not just about this reflection. The question of the noumenal — value-semantic content of media culture — is much more complicated. The cultural approach to the study of media culture is associated with its noumenal understanding, its peculiarity is aimed to identify the value-semantic content of media culture.

This type of content appears to be a two-level education. In the semantic and axiological space of media culture, two groups of values and meanings can be distinguished.

The first group consists of general cultural values and meanings. Media culture, in a certain sense, is everywhere, it can embody political, economic, religious, and moral values and meanings, it can be either a conductor of a particular moral doctrine, political ideology, religious dogma, socio-economic strategy, or its criticizer. Media culture is the sphere of encoding and decoding various kinds of meanings. At the same time, an important role in this process is played by the belonging of the cultural code to the pre-written, written (printed), and screen types.

The second group consists of values and meanings directly related to media reality. Media philosophy has shown that each historical type of media culture has its own value-semantic potential, which affects the value-semantic structure of culture as a whole. Pre-written (oral), written, printed, and screen (analog and digital) media cultures are some value-semantic systems that largely

determine the value-semantic landscape of certain historical epochs. I will try to demonstrate this statement using examples from the history of culture.

It seems obvious that the birth of culture is associated not so much with the appearance of the first artificial (non-natural) ways of life or the first attempts to understand the world, but with the fixation-codification in the collective memory of archaic society of these ways and meanings in the form of mythopoetic complexes.

The pre-written — an oral way of fixing-encoding culture, inherent in archaic culture — determines its key characteristics; dogmatism, syncretism, collectivism. Indeed, if all efforts are aimed at preserving a significant amount of information in memory, then any attempts to change, supplement, or dissect it are considered as threats to its loss. Mythopoetic complexes based on imaginative and emotional thinking are much easier to remember, and this is a collective memory, which determines the value of collectivism.

The transition from the pre-written paradigm to the written one is comparable to a revolution. F. Engels considered the emergence of writing as one of the conditions for civilization formation [Engels, 2019]. The formation of alphabetic writing is a separate story. It is no accident that this chronologically coincides with the “axial time” (K. Jaspers), i.e. the time of birth of a person who reflects. It is alphabetic writing that opens up the possibility of transition from myth to logos, the development of rationalism, philosophy, and protoscience.

The appearance of the printed method of recording and encoding information can be regarded as a revolutionary shift, since it is at the origins of the modernization of culture (the birth of modernity culture). McLuhan believes that printing sets the standard for mass industrial production. However, it does not just set the standard for mass production, but generates phenomena such as individualism, scientism, and even liberalism. The transformation of the state into a “night watchman”, i.e. bureaucratization of the state, understood by M. Weber as a transition from the traditional to the legal type of “domination — subordination”, it's impossible outside of printed forms of recording information. Finally, civil society cannot exist without universal literacy, just as science cannot exist without the institution of scientific publications.

The appearance of the screen method of recording-encoding cultural information, the appearance of video, in which the visual is combined with the auditory — a new serious shift, leading to an unprecedented developing of mass oriented culture, which has become a foundation of a consumer society, and at the same time setting unprecedented conditions for manipu-

lating people's minds, contributing to the development of such a phenomenon as totalitarianism.

It is not necessary to absolutize the role of media culture in the processes of social and cultural development of mankind, but it is not necessary to underestimate it. However, modern social cultural realities hardly allow us to qualify the role of media culture as secondary.

5.3. *The structure of media culture.* Media culture is a multidimensional phenomenon that can be viewed from different perspectives or points of reference and each time receiving new results. You can distinguish different media subcultures — by age, gender, ethnic, national, social, regional principles; you can represent historical types of media culture. The division of media culture into mass and elite, dominant and countercultural, totalitarian and democratic types is still relevant. Finally, the structuring of media culture can be based on the idea that there are some ideal types of media culture. I think the typological triad is very heuristic in terms of research: traditional media culture, utilitarian media culture, and creative media culture.

5.4. *The functions of media culture.* Recording, encoding, and broadcasting information makes it responsible for such an important aspect of cultural existence as the reproduction of culture. It seems that the simple, extended, and destructive reproduction of culture is largely defined by the functionality or dysfunctionality of media culture. For example, the loss of media artifacts leads to a destructive reproduction of culture. The appearance of new media is an essential peculiarity for extended cultural reproduction. Creating a new method of fixing-encoding information can be seen as a trigger that opens up the flow of innovation. What is the secret of such creativity in media culture?

Answering this question, I would like to mention such a phenomenon as similarity of the concepts of “media culture” and “mediation”. In cultural studies, the concept of “mediation” is used to denote a certain logic of culture, the essence of which is aimed at overcoming the opposite meanings that have developed in the culture and forming a semantic synthesis. Levi-Strauss has positioned mediation as going beyond the inherent archaic thinking structural binarism, as a mechanism for the resolution of semantic inconsistencies, by replacing the original binary opposition by other less contradictory ones, to fully overcome it [Levi-Strauss, 1963, 240–280]. A. S. Akhiezer considers mediation as a “middle culture that is characterized by the rejection of absolute polarities and maximization of attention to their interdependence, to their existence through each other, creating new meanings” [Akhiezer,

1998, 271]. A. P. Davydov defines mediation as the logic of “removing” the opposite meanings that have developed in the culture, the basis of semantic genesis [Davydov, 2000, 82]. A. A. Pelipenko considers mediation as the principle of forming new meanings based on overcoming the original semantic oppositions and productive semantic synthesis [Pelipenko, 2016, 26–87].

It seems that the development of mediation and the development of media culture are interdependent processes. The formation of a new way of fixing-encoding information is, in fact, a consequence of the implementation of the mediation logic of culture. The new method of fixing-encoding information, in turn, opens up new opportunities for promoting mediation logic. For example, the “invention” of modern notation (the modern method of recording and encoding musical works) did not happen out of nowhere, it happened due to the synthesis of various elements of the theory and practice of musical creativity. The “invention” of modern notation, in turn, provokes the “invention” of opera, symphony, etc. Within the framework of letter or non-letter notation, neither opera nor symphony is simply possible. In other words, a new way of fixing-encoding information is born because there are changes in the culture that needs this method. At the same time with the advent of a new way of fixing-encoding information, the flow of innovations increases, since there is a way of fixing that attracts them. In essence, media culture can be considered as a supporting structure of culture that serves as an attractor in the process of cultural self-organization.

5.5. *Mechanisms of development of media culture* would be easier to describe based on the theory of self-organization — the search for new ways of fixing and encoding information is nothing more than a struggle with the growing entropy: disorganization of culture. The development of culture, like any other open system, is a process of increasing complexity and diversity. Therefore, the search for new, more “effective” ways of fixing and encoding information is a negentropic work. The transition from one method of fixing-encoding information to another is dramatic. Changing types of media culture is perceived as a cultural crisis, as a mass intellectual degradation. As a rule, it is accompanied by a conflict of generations. However, in the media culture, the new type of fixation-encoding of information never completely replaces the old one. The old type fades into the background, forming a cultural foundation, on the one hand, and a cultural sub-voice in the polyphonic texture of culture, on the other hand. However, the complete loss of an artifact in the media culture is also quite frequent.

### 5.6. *Culture of media vs media culture*

It is obvious that in contrast to arithmetic, where the sum does not change because of replacement of terms, in the humanities, the word order radically changes the meaning of the phrase. For example, media philosophy and philosophy of media are different concepts. In the first case, we are talking about the philosophical reflection on media reality. And in the second case, we are talking about the philosophy that certain media carries. This effect is relevant for the case of media culture. Media culture and culture of media are far from the same thing, although these meanings are often mixed in texts. Media culture, as I have already pointed out above, is a special form of culture, without which there would be no culture as such. The concept of “media culture” cannot be evaluated. It cannot be low or high, perfect or imperfect, bad or good. Media culture is what it is. This principle regarding culture was first formulated by G. Rickert [Rickert, 1995, P. 90].

The concept of “culture of media”, on the contrary, is an evaluative concept, it concerns the characteristics of specific media phenomena. You can talk about the perfect and imperfect culture of media or you can talk about high and low culture of the media. Culture of media can be destructive, immoral, or disruptive, but this does not mean that media culture is a harmful phenomenon. The Internet has many problems, but this does not mean that the Internet is destructive. You can also talk about a smartphone, computer, TV, etc.

It seems that the separation of the concepts of “media culture” and “culture of media” helps to clarify the situation with new media. In particular, it makes it clear that the solution to modern moral dilemmas related to the negative aspects of modern media lies not in the rejection of these media, but in the rejection of the culture that they carry.

## 6. Conclusions

Having read contemporary authors who study various aspects of media, one cannot help but wonder if this area of scientific research has been covered by a long, familiar disease associated with the desire to unnecessarily generate entities? Indeed, media research discourse is already large despite the fact that it is still young in our country. There are countless concepts that include the lexeme “media” today, including those that claim to be called scientific disciplines: media philosophy, mediology, media studies, media pedagogy, media sociology, media political science, media linguistics, media psychology, etc. So is media culture also relevant?

I believe that we need it as much as we need economic cultural studies, political cultural studies, legal cultural studies, etc. Undoubtedly, media culture is one of the basic forms of culture today, evidenced by at least such a curious fact that when a modern person wakes up in the morning, he turns not to God, not to close people — parents, children — but to a medium, a smartphone, from which he draws not just information, but the meaning of life. The culture of humanity in the twenty-first century is inexplicably moving into media reality. And yet, culture and media culture have been and will continue to be related to each other. Therefore, I consider the separation of a special branch of cultural studies — media culture studies — to be a process of discipline fragmentation, which may turn media culture research into empirical descriptions with lack of theoretical guidelines. And the growing chaos in these studies may ultimately happen. Moreover, the media culture considered in isolation from the cultural theoretical context turns into a culture of mass communication and mass information; only cultural studies with its theoretical and methodological apparatus can raise the research of media culture to conceptual generalizations, which result in the idea that the concept of “media culture” means a certain fragment of cultural reality, one of the forms of culture that has a multi-layered phenomenal and noumenal content, complex structure, vital functions and complex mechanisms of dynamics.

### References:

1. E. I. Kuznetsova. Mediakul'tura: k problematizatsii ponyatiya [Media Culture: towards the problematization of the concept] *Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obshchestvo*. Vol. XI, Issue 3 (No. 50) (2009), pp. 356–361.
2. M. G. Vakhrusheva. Mediakul'tura: ponyatiye, struktura [Media Culture: the concept, structure]. *Modernizatsiya kul'tury: idei i paradigmy kul'turnykh izmeneniy: materialy Mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii* [Modernization of culture: ideas and paradigms of cultural changes: proceedings of the International scientific and practical conference] / Ed. S. V. Solovyov, V. I. Iones, L. M. Artamonov. Samara: Samara State Institute of Culture (2014), pp. 191–196.
3. S. Toulmin. *Human understanding*. Clarendon press, Oxford (1972).
4. D. Kellner. *Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity, and Politics Between the Modern and the Postmodern*. Routledge, London (1995).
5. A. Hepp. *Cultures of Mediatization*. Polity, Cambridge (2013).
6. T. W. Adorno, M. Horkheimer. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, 2nd edn. Verso Publishing, London (1986).



7. A. Chernykh. *Mir sovremennykh media* [The world of modern media]. Moscow: publishing house “Territoriya budushchego” (2007).
8. R. Hoggart. *The Uses of literature*. Penguin Books Harmondsworth, London (1960).
9. R. Williams. *Culture & Society 1780–1950*. Doubleday & Company, Inc. Garden City New York (1960), pp. 316–338.
10. S. Hall. *Encoding/ Decoding. Media and Cultural Studies*. KeyWorks. London: Blackwell Publishers (2001), pp. 164–175.
11. V. Kurennoy. *Issledovatel'skaya i politicheskaya programma kul'turnykh issledovaniy* [Research and political program of cultural research]. *Logos*, No. 1 (2012), pp. 14–79.
12. R. Barthes. *Mythologies* Selected and translated from the French by Annette Lavers. The noonday press — New York Farrar, Straus & Giroux (1991).
13. J. Baudrillard. *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. Published in Association with Theory, Culture & Society (Volume 25). Sage Publications (CA) (1993).
14. V. V. Savchuk. *Filosofiya epokhi novykh media* [Philosophy of the new media era]. *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 10 (2012), pp. 33–42.
15. M. McLuhan. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. McGraw-Hill, New York (1964).
16. F. Kittler. *Optical media. Berlin lectures 1999*. *Logos*, Moscow (2009).
17. A. Roesler. *Medienphilosophie und Zeichentheorie. Medienphilosophie. Beiträge zur Klärung eines Begriffs* / Hrsg. Munker S., Roesler A., Sandbothe M. Frankfurt am Main (2003), pp. 78–90.
18. W. Benjamin. *Medienästhetische Schriften* / Hrsg. und Nachwort von Detlev Schöttker. Suhrkamp Taschenbuch, F.a.M. (2002).
19. E. V. Kolesnikov. *Ponyatiye “media”: kriticheskiy analiz* [The Concept of media: a critical analysis]. *Molodoy uchenyy*, No. 18 (152) (2017), pp. 292–296.
20. P. Bourdieu. *Le champ scientifique*. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, No. 2/3 (1976), pp. 88–104.
21. J. Simondon. *On the mode of existence of technical objects*. *Almanac “Translit”*, No. 9 (2011), pp. 94–105.
22. N. B. Kirilova. *Mediakul'tura: ot moderna k postmodernu* [Mediaculture: from modern to postmodern]. *Akademicheskiy proyekt*, Moscow (2005).
23. F. Engels. *Origin of the family, private property and the state*. AST publishing House, Moscow (2019).
24. C. Levi-Strauss. *Structural Anthropology*. Basic book, New York (1963), pp. 240–280.

25. A. S. Akhiezer. Rossiya: kritika istoricheskogo opyta (Sotsiokul'turnaya dinamika Rossii) [Russia: critique of historical experience (socio and cultural dynamics of Russia)]. Theory and methodology. Dictionary. Vol. 2. Siberian chronograph, Novosibirsk (1998), 594 p.

26. A. P. Davydov. Problema mediatsii v yevropeyskoy kul'ture: Zapad i Rossiya [The problem of mediation in European culture: The West and Russia]. Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost', No. 6 (2000), pp. 82–93.

27. A. A. Pelipenko. Kontrevolyutsiya [Counter-evolution]. Publishing House "Znaniye", Moscow (2016).

28. G. Rikkert. Nauki o prirode i nauki o kul'ture [Science about nature and Sciences about culture]. Kul'turologiya XX vek: Antologiya [Cultural studies of the XX century: an anthology], Yurist, Moscow (1995).

DOI 10.15826/B978-5-7996-3081-2.23

## **Language Diversity in Business Communication in the Social Network Instagram (On the Example of Bars, Cafes and Restaurants Ads)**

**Gudova Margarita<sup>1</sup>, Litwinova Anastasia<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Ural Federal University, Ekaterinburg, Russia

<sup>2</sup> Ural Federal University, Ekaterinburg, Russia

Corresponding author: Gudova Margarita, MargGoodova@gmail.com

**Abstract.** The research subject of this article is the language diversity of the European restaurant business. The methodology is defined by the understanding of polylinguism as the diversity of languages used in the same text, where each of the languages performs its own communicative functions. The study was performed using the Case Studies method, due to which the author managed to review a certain amount of cafes, bars and restaurants via the social network Instagram made over the past year, analyze the use of different languages, and draw a conclusion about the pragmatic aspects of their use.

**Keywords:** Instagram, language diversity, polylinguism, social network